



RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION SC
POST OFFICE BOX 26618
MILWAUKEE, WI 53226

COPY MAILED

APR 19 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Joseph W. Boggs et al
Application No. 10/662,055
Filed: September 12, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 9469.18443

:
: DECISION ON PETITIONS
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
:

This is a decision on the petition, filed November 4, 2004, which is being treated, for the reasons stated below, as a petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of prior-filed nonprovisional Application No. 10/113,828, filed March 29, 2002, and, presumably, provisional Application No. 60/280,222.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Initially, in reviewing the amendment in the petition, it is noted that Application No. 10/113,828 is being claimed as both a nonprovisional and as a provisional application, which is clearly in error. In view of the fact that Application No. 10/113,828 claims priority to provisional Application No. 60/280,222, it is presumed that petitioner meant to claim priority to that application. Therefore, the petition is being treated both as a petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6).

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require

additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition fails to comply with item (1) above.

The amendment submitted concurrently with the instant petition as drafted is unacceptable and, therefore, is not considered a proper reference under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(iii) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) and (a)(5)(iii). In this regard, the amendment is physically part of the instant petition and, as such, does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). Note that 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with § 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority), must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Additionally, if petitioner is also seeking to claim priority to provisional Application No. 60/280,222, then an incorporation by reference statement would be inappropriate in any subsequently filed amendment. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a renewed petition and a substitute amendment (complying with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121) and correcting the above matters is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITIONS
 Commissioner for Patents
 Post Office Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Service Window
 Mail Stop Petitions
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (703) 872-9306
 ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Irvin Dingle at (571) 272-3210.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frances Hicks".

Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy